arXiv:1604.05209v3 [physics.soc-ph] 25 Oct 2016

Channel is more important than effectiveness in spreading dynamics on multiplex networks

Ming Li,[1] Run-Ran Liu,[2] Dan Peng,[3] Chun-Xiao Jia,[2] and Bing-Hong Wang[4]

[1]*School of Engineering Science, University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei, 230026, P. R. China*

[2]*Alibaba Research Center for Complexity Sciences, Hangzhou Normal University, Hangzhou, 311121, P. R. China*

[3]*Center of Medical Physics and Technology, Hefei Institutes of Physical Science, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Hefei, 230031, P. R. China*

[4]*Department of Modern Physics, University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei, 230026, P. R. China*

(Dated: October 26, 2016)

Abstract

When multiplex connections are considered in the spreading process, there are two general scenarios for a node to transmit pathogen or information to others. One is transmitting to the same nodes through different links, which increases the success rate of spreading. Another is transmitting to different nodes through different links. This increases the number of recipients that will likely become infected or informed nodes. To get a better understanding of the effects of the two scenarios on the spreading dynamics, we propose an epidemic model on multiplex networks with link overlapping. Through simulation and theoretical studies, we find that for Poisson degree distributions, the first scenario gives a larger epidemic threshold than the second one, i.e., the overlapping of the two layers suppresses the spreading process. For power-law degree distributions, above some epidemic probabilities, the overlapping will also suppress the spreading process. However, below that, the overlapping turn to facilitate the spreading, as the hub nodes in these networks have already provided enough epidemic channel locally. All these indicate that the epidemic channel could play an important role in the spreading dynamics.

I. INTRODUCTION

The spreading process is one of the important research fields in network science[1], which can not only model the spreading of epidemic, opinion and rumor in our daily life, but also reflect some universal physical properties, such as phase transition property. The models usually used in these studies are the so-called SIR and SIS models. Here, S stands for susceptible, I for infective, and R for removed or recovered. In the spreading process, at each time step, an S will become an I with a epidemic probability if it is adjacent to an I. At the same time, I could recover and become an S (SIS), or acquire immunity (or die) and become an R (SIR) with another probability, which often takes value 1 to simplify the model. These studies focus on the relationship between the number of S (SIS) or R (SIR) and the epidemic probability. Mathematically, these researches aim to get the epidemic threshold, above which there is an outbreak of pathogen, opinion or rumor in the system.

In theory, the degree-based mean-field theory is often used to solve the SIS model[2], which is developed from the classic method for that in a well-mixed system[3]. For SIR model, the bond percolation is one of the prevalent methods[4]. The bond percolation considers the emergence of the giant component connected by occupied links, when each link is occupied with a probability T. Here, the giant component is a connected component that contains a constant fraction of the entire network's nodes[5]. Obviously, for a probability T, if there is no giant component in the network, the pathogen, opinion or rumor can not spread widely in the network for an SIR model with epidemic probability T. Therefore, the critical point T_c of the bond percolation on the network is also the epidemic threshold of the corresponding SIR model. In simulations, instead of evolving the system step by step as the spreading mechanism required, we can also use the bond percolation to model the spreading process for a lower time complexity.

In recent years, the models with two or more spreading processes interacting on a multiplex network have been proposed to study the complex spreading process in real world[6]. In these models, the nodes can interact with each other through different channels, which are represented by the links in different layers of a multiplex network. The previous studies mainly consider the interaction of pathogen or information on the same system but different layers, such as two pathogens with mutual exclusion mechanism[7, 8], spreading of an epidemic and information awareness to prevent infection[9–11], collaborating epidemic[12], immunization strategy[13], and cooperative epidemics[14]. Although the modeling methods for these critical issues may be different, bond



FIG. 1. A simple graphical representation of the spreading dynamics on multiplex network with link overlapping. There is only one set of nodes in the system, and links of the two layers A and B are represented by dash and solid lines, respectively. (a) Node 1 can transmit pathogen to two different nodes (nodes 2 and 3) with probabilities T^A (layer A) and T^B (layer B), respectively. (b) Node 1 can transmit pathogen to node 3 through different layers with probabilities T^A (layer A) and T^B (layer B), respectively. Overall, the probability is $1-(1-T^A)(1-T^B) = T^A + T^B - T^A T^B$. It is clear that the infection rate of node 3 in case (b) is larger than that of case (a), however, in case (b) node 2 will never be infected by node 1.

percolation has been treated as a mainstream approach[15]. The findings of these works indicate that the multi-interaction plays an important role in the spreading dynamics.

The multi-interaction in these spreading dynamics has two key roles: One is improving the success rate for local spreading, the other is increasing the global epidemic channels (see Fig.1). To get a better understanding of the two cases, we will study a spreading process on multiplex networks with link overlapping in this paper. By adjusting the fraction of overlapping in a fixed total number of links, we can get the differences and combined effects of the epidemic channel and probability in the spreading dynamics on multiplex network. Note that this model is different with the epidemics on interconnected networks[16–18] or coupled networks with node overlapping[19, 20]. In those models, the nodes for different layers are also different and the overlapping refers to nodes. That is the main difference between multiplex networks and interconnected networks.

The paper is organized as follows. In Sec.II, the details of our model will be given. We will give a corresponding bond percolation model to solve this problem in Sec.III, and then some examples and simulation results will be presented in Sec.IV. In the last section, we will report our conclusions.

II. MODEL

Our model displays on a multiplex network with two layers, labeled as A and B. We assume that the pathogen spreads from a node to its neighbors according to SIR model. That is, a node can be in one of the three states: susceptible (S) for the ones that not yet infected, or infectious (I) for the ones have already been infected and can transmit the pathogen to other nodes, or recovered (R) for the ones acquire immunity (or die). To characterize the different efficiencies of spreading channels in different layers, we assume at each time step I nodes can transmit the pathogen to their S neighbors in layers A and B with probabilities T^A and T^B, respectively. I nodes will become R nodes immediately in the next time step.

Using this model, we want to study the opinion or rumor spreads online and offline simultaneously, and investigate the effects of the epidemic channel and effectiveness on the spreading dynamics as shown in Fig.1. We assume that a fraction β of links in layer A overlaps with the links of layer B. For two nodes connected directly in both layers, the corresponding epidemic probability between the two nodes can be expressed by a overall probability $1-(1-T^A)(1-T^B) = T^A + T^B - T^AT^B$. Since this probability is larger than the probabilities T^A and T^B, it is seem that the overlapping links will improve the local epidemic effectiveness, and make the outbreak of pathogen or rumor more easily. However, in this case the epidemic channels of a node will be less than that without overlapping (see Fig.1), which indicates that the overlapping will also suppress the spreading from a global perspective. Overall, the overlapping has positive and negative influences on spreading process. In the next section, we will show the integral effects of the two aspects by both simulation and analysis.

III. THEORY

A. Bond percolation

In a network, we assume that a link does not lead to the giant component with a probability $1-\varphi$, then the probability that a node of degree k does not belong to the giant component is $(1-\varphi)^k$, i.e., all its links can not lead to the giant component. Averaging over the degree distribution of the network, we obtain the fraction of the nodes that not belong to the giant component,

$$1-\psi = \sum_{k=0} p_k(1-\varphi)^k. \tag{1}$$

Here, ψ just is the order parameter of the percolation transition, i.e., the fraction of nodes in the giant component. To obtain φ, we must check the excess-degree of the node reached by following a link[21], that is

$$1-\varphi=\sum_{k=1}\frac{p_k k}{z}(1-\varphi)^{k-1}, \tag{2}$$

where z is the average degree, and $p_k k/z$ is the excess-degree distribution of a network with degree distribution p_k.

For bond percolation with link occupied probability T, only the occupied links are considered, so we can solve it by

$$\varphi=1-G_1(1-T\varphi), \tag{3}$$

$$\psi=1-G_0(1-T\varphi). \tag{4}$$

Here, $G_0(x)=\sum_k p_k x^k$ and $G_1(x)=\sum_k p_k k x^{k-1}/z$ are the corresponding generating functions of degree and excess-degree distributions, respectively. Solving eq.(3) in the condition of $\varphi\to 0$, we can get the critical point,

$$T_c=\frac{1}{G_1'(1)}. \tag{5}$$

As pointed in ref.[4], when we consider T as the epidemic probability of an SIR model, the critical point T_c will also be the epidemic threshold.

B. General formalism

As our model setting, it can be mapped into a bond percolation model on a network with three occupied probabilities T^A, T^B and $T^{AB}=T^A+T^B-T^AT^B$. Assuming that the average degrees of the two layers are z^A and z^B. Then, the average degree of the overlapping links is βz^A. Excluding these links, the average degrees of layers A and B are $(1-\beta)z^A$ and $z^B-\beta z^A$, respectively. In what follows, we will use script a, b and ab to distinguish the parameters for the three types of links, i.e., a for the links in layer A excluding the overlapping links, b for the links in layer B excluding the overlapping links and ab for the overlapping links.

Next, let us solve this bond percolation problem. As mentioned above, it is straightforward that if a node belongs to the giant component, at least one of its links (any types) must be occupied and connect to the giant component. This indicates that the fraction of the nodes in the giant

component ψ can be written as

$$\psi = 1 - \sum_{k^a,k^b,k^{ab}} p_{k^a,k^b,k^{ab}} (1 - T^A \varphi^a)^{k^a} (1 - T^B \varphi^b)^{k^b} (1 - T^{AB} \varphi^{ab})^{k^{ab}}. \tag{6}$$

Here, $p_{k^a,k^b,k^{ab}}$ is the joint distribution of the degrees k^a, k^b and k^{ab}, and φ is the probability that a node, reached by following a corresponding link, belongs to the giant component. So, the second term of the right hand side of eq.(6) means all the links of a randomly chosen node can not lead to the giant component. If the three types of degrees are independent of each other, eq.(6) can be expressed in a simple form by the generating functions of these degree distributions,

$$\psi = 1 - G_0^a(1 - T^A \varphi^a) G_0^b(1 - T^B \varphi^b) G_0^{ab}(1 - T^{AB} \varphi^{ab}). \tag{7}$$

To obtain ψ, we must get φ^a, φ^b and φ^{ab} firstly. Using the generating function of the excess-degree distribution as eq.(3), we can express φ^a, φ^b and φ^{ab} as

$$\varphi^a = 1 - G_1^a(1 - T^A \varphi^a) G_0^b(1 - T^B \varphi^b) G_0^{ab}(1 - T^{AB} \varphi^{ab}), \tag{8}$$

$$\varphi^b = 1 - G_0^a(1 - T^A \varphi^a) G_1^b(1 - T^B \varphi^b) G_0^{ab}(1 - T^{AB} \varphi^{ab}), \tag{9}$$

$$\varphi^{ab} = 1 - G_0^a(1 - T^A \varphi^a) G_0^b(1 - T^B \varphi^b) G_1^{ab}(1 - T^{AB} \varphi^{ab}). \tag{10}$$

Here, the second terms of the right hand sides of eqs.(8)-(10) mean all the excess links of a node reached by following a corresponding link can not lead to the giant component. These equations hold only for the case that k^a, k^b and k^{ab} are independent of each other, or we must write them in a form similar to eq.(6).

In general, we can solve eqs.(8)-(10) to obtain φ^a, φ^b and φ^{ab}, and then insert them into eq.(7) to get the order parameter ψ. Below the critical point T_c^A or T_c^B, all these will lead to a zero ψ, corresponding to that the pathogen or rumor dies out.

IV. SIMULATION RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A. Poisson degree distribution

As an example, we consider the case that the two layers are both Erdős-Rényi(ER) networks with random overlapping. Thus, it is easy to know that all the three degree distributions p_k^a, p_k^b and p_k^{ab} used in eqs.(8)-(10) follow Poisson distribution. In this case, $G_0(x) = G_1(x) = e^{z(x-1)}$, and

$G_0'(1) = G_1'(1) = z$, so ψ, φ^a, φ^b and φ^{ab} are equivalent. This yields

$$\begin{aligned}\psi &= 1 - e^{-\left[T^A(1-\beta)z^A + T^B(z^B - \beta z^A) + T^{AB}\beta z^A\right]\psi} \\ &= 1 - e^{-\left(T^A z^A + T^B z^B - \beta T^A T^B z^A\right)\psi}.\end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

There are two control parameters T^A and T^B in this equation, so we will check its solutions from the following two cases.

Case $1:$ $T^A = T^B = T$. For this case, the occupied probabilities T^A and T^B for the two layers are equal to each other. From the simulation results shown in Fig.2 (a), we can find that for two given layers, the critical points of the bond percolation increase with the overlapping. In other words, the overlapping suppresses the spreading. This result seems counterintuitive, since the epidemic probability through the overlapping links is larger than that of non-overlapping links ($T^{AB} > T$). To understand this, another effect of the overlapping must be considered, that is the effective epidemic channels are decreasing with the overlapping (see Fig.1). Specifically, since the degrees are fixed, there are always $z^A + z^B$ links for each node in the system to transmit the pathogen or rumor. However, for each node, βz^A links in layer B overlap with that of layer A on average, that is the number of the available epidemic channels are $(1-\beta)z^A + z^B$, which decreases with the overlapping fraction. Therefore, overlapping has two sides to spreading dynamics on multiplex network, one is enhancing the epidemic probability and the other is reducing the number of epidemic channels. For these reasons, the results shown in Fig.2 indicate that an additional layer will facilitate the spreading, regardless of the correlation between the original network and the additional layer. However, the best is the one without link overlapping. That is to say that the epidemic channel may play a more important role in the spreading process than the epidemic probability itself.

Approaching the critical point, $\psi \to 0$, so we can solve eq.(11) in this condition to get the critical point, that is

$$\beta z^A T_c^2 - (z^A + z^B)T_c + 1 = 0. \tag{12}$$

Obviously, eq.(12) gives

$$T_c = \frac{z^A + z^B - \sqrt{(z^A + z^B)^2 - 4\beta z^A}}{2\beta z^A}. \tag{13}$$

So now, we obtain the critical point of the system. This theoretical result is consistent with the simulation results shown in Fig.2 (a), which demonstrates that the overlapping does not always facilitate the spreading as previous direct understanding.



FIG. 2. (color online) (a) The giant component ψ as a function of the occupied probability T. The size of the network is $N = 10^5$, and the average degrees of the two layers are $z^A = z^B = 3$, respectively. The degree distributions p_k^a, p_k^b and p_k^{ab} are all Poisson distribution. The corresponding lines are the theoretical results obtained by eq.(11). (b) The critical point of the bond percolation T_c as a function of the overlapping fraction β. The size of the network is $N = 10^6$. The corresponding lines are the theoretical results obtained by eq.(13).

Case 2 : $T^A = constant$. Similar with case 1, we can also solve eq.(11) in the condition $\psi \to 0$ to obtain the critical point, the only difference is that T^A is a constant. This yields

$$T_c^B = \frac{1 - T^A z^A}{z^B - \beta T^A z^A}. \tag{14}$$

From this equation, we can find that for

$$T^A \geq \frac{1}{z^A}, \tag{15}$$

$T_c^B < 0$, which means that there is no percolation transition in this system, and the giant component will always exist in this system. In other words, for this epidemic probability T^A, the pathogen or rumor can outbreak in the system without the participation of layer B, and T^B only affects the outbreak size of the pathogen or rumor. In addition, if T^B is a constant, the situation is similar, we do not repeat here for reason of brevity.

The simulation results for this case are shown in Fig.3, which are in agreement with our analysis well. From Fig.3, we can also find the similar results with case 1, that is the link overlapping suppresses the spreading process.



FIG. 3. (color online) (a) The giant component ψ as a function of the occupied probability T^B. The size of the network is $N = 10^5$. The corresponding lines are the theoretical results obtained by eq.(11). (b) The critical point T_c^B of the bond percolation as a function of the overlapping average fraction β. The size of the network is $N = 10^6$. The corresponding lines are the theoretical results obtained by eq.(14). The average degrees of the networks used in the simulation are $z^A = z^B = 3$.

B. Scale-free degree distribution

For real networks, the degree distribution often takes the form $p_k \sim k^{-\gamma}, 2 < \gamma < 3$, that is the scale-free network. For this distribution, $G_1'(1)$ will be divergency, that leads to $T_c \to 0$ (see eq.(5)). For multiplex network, if one layer takes such a degree distribution, the degree of the overlapping links must obey the same distribution but with a smaller average degree. This results in that we can not freely choose the degree distribution of the other layers, unless the overlapping links are very few.

To study our model with a scale-free degree distribution, we generate a multiplex network as follow. First, we generate a scale-free network by the configuration model[22] as one layer of the network, i.e., generating links of layer A. Then, randomly choosing a fraction β of these links to be the overlapping links ab, the others are a links. At last, b links can also be generated by the configuration model, here, we use Poisson degree distribution with $z^B = z^A$. Obviously, p_{k^A}, p_{k^a} and $p_{k^{ab}}$ follow the same scale-free distribution but different average degrees z^A, $(1-\beta)z^A$ and βz^A (see Fig.4 (a)). However, for layer B, the degree distribution p_{k^B} would be a special distribution, which depends on $p_{k^{ab}}$ and p_{k^b}. As shown in Fig.4 (b), with the increasing of β, p_{k^B} will turn from



FIG. 4. (color online) The degree distributions of the multiplex network generated by the method presented in the text. (a) The degree distribution of the overlapping link $p_{k^{ab}}$ for different overlapping fraction. (b) The degree distribution of layer B, p_{k^B} for different overlapping fraction. In the simulation, layer A takes a scale-free degree distribution $p_{k^A} \sim \left(k^A\right)^{-\gamma}$ with $\gamma = 2.7$. The network size is $N = 10^5$, and the corresponding average degrees are $z^A = z^B = 3.752$. The red dashed line demonstrates the power-law relation with scaling exponent -2.7, and the blue dot line follows a Poisson distribution with average 3.752.

a Poisson distribution to a power law.

Before showing the simulation results, let us revisit the theoretical result in the last section. Obviously, eq.(6) can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned}\psi &= 1 - \sum_{k^A} p_{k^A} \sum_{i=0}^{k^A} \binom{k^A}{i} \beta^i (1 - T^{AB}\varphi^A)^i (1-\beta)^{k^A - i} (1 - T^A\varphi^A)^{k^A - i} \sum_{k^b} p_{k^b} (1 - T^B\varphi^b)^{k^b} \\ &= 1 - G_0^A \left[1 - T^A\varphi^A - \beta(1-T^A)T^B\varphi^A\right] G_0^b(1 - T^B\varphi^b). \end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

Here, p_{k^A} is the scale-free degree distribution of layer A we used. Similarly, eqs.(8)-(10) can also be rewritten as

$$\varphi^A = 1 - G_1^A \left[1 - T^A\varphi^A - \beta(1-T^A)T^B\varphi^A\right] G_0^b(1 - T^B\varphi^b), \tag{17}$$

$$\varphi^b = 1 - G_0^A \left[1 - T^A\varphi^A - \beta(1-T^A)T^B\varphi^A\right] G_1^b(1 - T^B\varphi^b). \tag{18}$$

For scale-free degree distributions, although we can not write the generating functions eqs.(16)-(18) into a simple form like that of Poisson degree distribution, they can also be solved by the



FIG. 5. (color online) The bond percolation on multiplex network with scale-free degree distribution. The networks are generated as the method presented in the text. The degree distribution of layer A satisfies $p_{k^A} \sim \left(k^A\right)^{-\gamma}$ with $\gamma = 2.7$. (a) The giant component ψ as a function of the occupied probability $T = T^A = T^B$. The network size is $N = 10^5$, and the corresponding average degrees are $z^A = z^B = 3.752$. The solid line is obtained by eqs.(16)-(18). The inset figure is the theoretical results for the crossing points of ψ with different β. (b) The number of nodes in the second largest component N_2 near the critical point for different overlapping fractions. (c) The number of nodes in the second largest component N_2 near the critical point for different network sizes. The overlapping fraction is $\beta = 0.3$.

discrete form of generating functions for a finite network size N. In addition, since p_k^A is a scale-free distribution, a divergency $G_1'(1)$ will be involved when we expand eqs.(17) and (18) near the critical point ($\varphi^A \to 0$, $\varphi^b \to 0$). This is to say our model will also give a critical point $T_c \to 0$.

In Fig.5, we give the simulation results and corresponding theoretical results for the case $T^A = T^B = T$, which agree with each other very well. Different from networks with Poisson degree distributions, these networks with larger overlapping fraction β do not always give a larger order parameter ψ. Above some probability T, the overlapping will suppress the spreading process as that found in the last subsection. However, below that, the overlapping will facilitate the spreading. This because that the hub nodes in the scale-free network has already provided many

epidemic channels. Therefore, when the epidemic probability is small, the overlapping facilitate the spreading since the overlapping increase the local epidemic probability. Especially, the pseudo-critical point indicated by the maximum of the second largest component will also decrease with the increasing of overlapping fraction β (see Fig.5 (b)). In addition, as shown in Fig.5 (c), all the pseudo-critical point tends to zero for networks with infinite size. However, for large epidemic probabilities, the epidemic channel will become important for spreading from a global perspective. So the overlapping suppresses the spreading process when epidemic probability T exceeds some values. Note that this value of T is not a fixed point for different β (see the inset figure of Fig.5 (a)).

For all results shown in Fig.5, we summarize that the pathogen or rumor will spread more easily over the multiplex network, if one of the layers takes a scale-free degree distribution, regardless of the degree distribution of the other layer. This also indicates that the epidemic channel is important for spreading dynamics on multiplex networks. When one layer can provide enough proper epidemic channels, an outbreak of pathogen or rumor will happen in the system.

V. CONCLUSION

In this paper we have studied an epidemic model on multiplex networks with overlapping, in which a pathogen or rumor can spread among nodes through two types of connections with different epidemic probabilities. A bond percolation method has been used to study this model on networks with Poisson and power-law degree distributions theoretically. We find that one of the two layers takes a power-law degree distribution will lead to a very small epidemic threshold, which just is zero for networks with infinite size, regardless of the overlapping fraction and the degree distribution of the other layer. This indicates that some proper epidemic channels are important for spreading dynamics on multiplex networks. More interesting, both the analysis and simulation results indicate that the link overlapping of two layers of a multiplex network does not always facilitate the spread of pathogen or rumor, though it increases the epidemic probability. For Poisson degree distributions, the overlapping always suppresses the spreading. While for power-law degree distributions, only above some epidemic probability, the overlapping can suppress the spreading. All these are caused by the two sides of the overlapping, i.e., increasing the success rate of local spreading and decreasing the epidemic channel globally.

For these results, we can conclude that the epidemic channel may play a more important role

in the spreading process than the epidemic probability. With enough or proper connection, a low infection pathogen or an incredible rumor can also spread widely in the social network. We think this finding will be helpful for the understanding of the spreading dynamics on real-world multiplex networks.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The research of M.L. was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China under Grant No. 61503355 and the Fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universities. The research of R.-R.L. and C.-X.J. were supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant Nos.: 11305042 and 61403114) and the Zhejiang Provincial Natural Science Foundation of China under Grant No. LQ14F030009. The research of B.-H.W. was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China under Grant No. 11275186.

[1] Romualdo Pastor-Satorras, Claudio Castellano, Piet Van Mieghem, and Alessandro Vespignani, "Epidemic processes in complex networks," Rev. Mod. Phys. **87**, 925–979 (2015).

[2] Romualdo Pastor-Satorras and Alessandro Vespignani, "Epidemic spreading in scale-free networks," Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 3200–3203 (2001).

[3] Norman T J Bailey, *The mathematical theory of infectious diseases and its applications* (Charles Griffin & Company Ltd, London, 1975).

[4] M. E. J. Newman, "Spread of epidemic disease on networks," Phys. Rev. E **66**, 016128 (2002).

[5] Béla Bollobás, *Random Graphs*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge University Press, 2001).

[6] S. Boccaletti, G. Bianconi, R. Criado, C.I. del Genio, J. Gómez-Gardeñes, M. Romance, I. Sendiña-Nadal, Z. Wang, and M. Zanin, "The structure and dynamics of multilayer networks," Physics Reports **544**, 1–122 (2014).

[7] Sebastian Funk and Vincent A. A. Jansen, "Interacting epidemics on overlay networks," Phys. Rev. E **81**, 036118 (2010).

[8] Vincent Marceau, Pierre-André Noël, Laurent Hébert-Dufresne, Antoine Allard, and Louis J. Dubé, "Modeling the dynamical interaction between epidemics on overlay networks," Phys. Rev. E **84**, 026105 (2011).

[9] Clara Granell, Sergio Gómez, and Alex Arenas, "Competing spreading processes on multiplex networks: Awareness and epidemics," Phys. Rev. E **90**, 012808 (2014).

[10] Emanuele Massaro and Franco Bagnoli, "Epidemic spreading and risk perception in multiplex networks: A self-organized percolation method," Phys. Rev. E **90**, 052817 (2014).

[11] Quantong Guo, Xin Jiang, Yanjun Lei, Meng Li, Yifang Ma, and Zhiming Zheng, "Two-stage effects of awareness cascade on epidemic spreading in multiplex networks," Phys. Rev. E **91**, 012822 (2015).

[12] Yong Min, Jiaren Hu, Weihong Wang, Ying Ge, Jie Chang, and Xiaogang Jin, "Diversity of multilayer networks and its impact on collaborating epidemics," Phys. Rev. E **90**, 062803 (2014).

[13] C. Buono and L. A. Braunstein, "Immunization strategy for epidemic spreading on multilayer networks," EPL (Europhysics Letters) **109**, 26001 (2015).

[14] N. Azimi-Tafreshi, "Cooperative epidemics on multiplex networks," Phys. Rev. E **93**, 042303 (2016).

[15] A. Hackett, D. Cellai, S. Gómez, A. Arenas, and J. P. Gleeson, "Bond percolation on multiplex networks," Phys. Rev. X **6**, 021002 (2016).

[16] Mark Dickison, S. Havlin, and H. E. Stanley, "Epidemics on interconnected networks," Phys. Rev. E **85**, 066109 (2012).

[17] Anna Saumell-Mendiola, M. Ángeles Serrano, and Marián Boguñá, "Epidemic spreading on interconnected networks," Phys. Rev. E **86**, 026106 (2012).

[18] Huijuan Wang, Qian Li, Gregorio D'Agostino, Shlomo Havlin, H. Eugene Stanley, and Piet Van Mieghem, "Effect of the interconnected network structure on the epidemic threshold," Phys. Rev. E **88**, 022801 (2013).

[19] Camila Buono, Lucila G. Alvarez-Zuzek, Pablo A. Macri, and Lidia A. Braunstein, "Epidemics in partially overlapped multiplex networks," PLoS ONE **9**, 1–5 (2014).

[20] O. Yagan, D. Qian, J. Zhang, and D. Cochran, "Conjoining speeds up information diffusion in overlaying social-physical networks," IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communications **31**, 1038–1048 (2013).

[21] Ming Li and Bing-Hong Wang, "Generating function technique in complex networks," Journal of Physics: Conference Series **604**, 012013 (2015).

[22] Mark E J Newman, *Networks: An Introduction* (Oxford University Press, New York, 2010).